UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,309	06/19/2007	Bernard Jeannin	115808-505	3498
29157 7590 08/02/2010 K&L Gates LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 1135	60600	PASCUA, JES F		
CHICAGO, IL 60690			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3782	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/02/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/568,309	JEANNIN, BERNARD			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jes F. Pascua	3782			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period is Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 F</u>	ebruarv 2006.				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 February 2006</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	·				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal F				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/20/06</u> . 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3782

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the one pair of strips located on an internal wall surface and another pair on an external wall surface (claim 10) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3782

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 09/20/06 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to provide an adequate written description of pair of strips located on an internal wall surface and another pair on an external wall surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3782

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 12-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by German Document No. 26 09 520 to Kimura.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Document No. 26 09 520 to Kimura.

Kimura discloses the claimed invention except for the width of the strips being about 1.2 mm to 2.5 mm. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the strips of Kimura 1.2 mm to 2.5 mm wide, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, there is nothing in applicant's specification that indicates 1.2 mm to 2.5 mm wide strips are critical and provide any unexpected result.

9. Claims 9, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Document No. 26 09 520 to Kimura and French Document No. 2 832 698 to Jammet et al.

Kimura discloses the claimed device except for the strips being located on the inner surface of the walls or within the laminate material. Jammet et al. discloses that it is known in the art to provide strips on the inner surface of the walls or within the laminate material of an analogous container. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the strips of Kimura on the inner surface of the walls or within the laminate material of the container, as suggested by Jammet et al., in order to hide the strips from view.

10. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Document No. 26 09 520 to Kimura and U.S. Patent No. 5,186,543 to Cochran.

Kimura discloses the claimed invention except for one pair of strips being located on an internal wall surface and another pair on an external wall surface. Fig. 12 Cochran discloses that it is known in the art to locate one pair of strips on an internal wall surface (i.e., interior pair of strips 30, 32) and another pair on an external wall surface (i.e., exterior pair of strips 30, 32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate one pair of strips on an internal wall surface and another pair on an external wall surface in the Kimura container, as suggested by Cochran, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3782

11. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Document No. 26 09 520 to Kimura.

Kimura discloses the claimed invention except for the strips being formed from polyester, polyethylene or polypropylene. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polyester, polyethylene or polypropylene for the strips of Kimura, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Furthermore, there is nothing applicant's specification indicating strips formed of polyester, polyethylene or polypropylene are critical or provide any unexpected result.

Conclusion

- 12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 13. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue

Art Unit: 3782

requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 714.02 and MPEP 2163.06. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jes F. Pascua whose telephone number is 571-272-4546. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3782

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jes F. Pascua/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3782